

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

I hereby certify that this transmittal of the below described document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service in an envelope bearing First Class Postage and addressed to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, D.C., 20231 on the below date of deposit.			
Date of Deposit:	10/04/04	Name of Person Making the Deposit:	KATHERINE RINALDI
		Signature of the Person Making the Deposit:	<i>Katherine Rinaldi</i>

In re Application of: Manfred Bartz, Marat Zhaksilikov and Douglas H. Anderson

Application No.: 09/ 989,765

Examiner: Nguyen, Maikhanh

Filed: 11/19/01

Art Unit: 2176

Confirmation No.: 2082

For: A USER INTERFACE FOR EFFICIENTLY BROWSING AN ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT USING DATA-DRIVEN TABS

**Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231****RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT TRANSMITTAL**

1. Transmitted herewith is a response to a restriction requirement for this application

☒ Transmitted herewith is a response to an office action for the above identified patent application.
(2 sheets)

Transmitted herewith are _____ sheets of drawings.

2. Applicant is other than a small entity

Extension of Term

3. The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.136 apply.

(a) [] Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136
(fees: 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)-(d) for the total number of months checked below:)

<u>Extension</u>	<u>Fee</u>
[] one month	\$110.00
[] two months	\$430.00
[] three months	\$938.00
[] four months	\$1,530.00

Fee \$ _____

If an additional extension of time is required, please consider this a petition therefor.

(b) [X] Applicant believes that no extension of term is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition for extension of time.

Fee Calculation

4. The fee for claims (37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)-(d)) has been calculated as shown below:

(for other than a small entity)					
Fee Items	Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest Number of Claims Previously Paid For	Present Extra Claims	Fee Rate	Total
Total Claims	34	- 34 =	0	x \$18.00	\$0.00
Independent Claims	4	- 4 =	0	x \$88.00	\$0.00
Multiple Dependent Claim Fee (one or more, first added by this amendment)				\$300.00	\$0.00
Total Fees					\$0.00

PAYMENT OF FEES


5. The full fee due in connection with this communication is provided as follows:
- [x] The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No.: 23-0085. A duplicate copy of this authorization is enclosed.
- [] A check in the amount of \$
- [] Charge any fees required or credit any overpayments associated with this filing to Deposit Account No.: 23-0085.

Please direct all correspondence concerning the above-identified application to the following address:

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
 Two North Market Street, Third Floor
 San Jose, California 95113
 (408) 938-9060
 Customer Number: 45545

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4 Oct 2004

By: 
 Matthew J. Blecher
 Reg. No. 46,558



2176
IFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
BARTZ, et al.) Examiner: Nguyen, Maikhanh
Serial No.: 09/989,765) Art Unit: 2176
Filed: November 19, 2001)
For: A USER INTERFACE FOR)
EFFICIENTLY BROWSING AN)
ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT)
USING DATA-DRIVEN TABS)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed September 17, 2004, please consider the following remarks.

CYPR-CD01194M/ACM/MJB
Examiner: Nguyen, Maikhanh

1

Serial No.: 09/989,765
Group Art Unit: 2176

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT


In the Office Action mailed September 17, 2004, the Examiner states that the present Application contains two patentably distinct inventions. The Examiner is requiring the Applicants to elect a single disclosed invention for examination. Specifically, the Examiner is requiring the Applicants to elect between a first invention, Invention I, recited in Claims 1-30; and a second invention, Invention II, recited in Claims 31-34.

Applicants elect without traverse Invention I, recited in Claims 1-30.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 4 Oct 2004


Matthew J. Blecher
Reg. No. 46,558

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060